

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>				1. CONTRACT ID CODE <b>S</b>		PAGE OF PAGES <b>1   8</b>	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. <b>0001</b>		3. EFFECTIVE DATE <b>12-Nov-2009</b>		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W81XWH93005001		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY USA MED RESEARCH ACQ ACTIVITY 820 CHANDLER ST FORT DETRICK MD 21702-5014		CODE <b>W81XWH</b>		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6)  <b>See Item 6</b>			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W81XWH-10-T-0029	
				X		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 12-Nov-2009	
						10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
<b>11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS</b>							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
<b>12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)</b>							
<b>13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.</b>							
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
<b>14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)</b>  Reflect accurate due dates for technical questions and proposals.							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)			
				TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED	
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)				BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		12-Nov-2009	

## SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES**

## SECTION SF 1449 - CONTINUATION SHEET

## SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

The required response date/time has changed from 20-Nov-2009 01:00 PM to 11-Dec-2009 01:00 PM.

The solicitation issue date has changed from 10-Nov-2009 to 12-Nov-2009.

The following have been modified:

PROPOSAL CONTENT**PROPOSAL CONTENT AND EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**1.0** Proposals must be submitted and received in two (2) separate volumes (I and II). Volume 1 shall be labeled "Non-Cost/Price Proposal" and Volume II shall be labeled "Business Proposal".

**1.1** All offerors proposing on this requirement are subject to the following timelines as stated herein. Technical questions are due to the Government point of contact, Justin Pickett, no later than 30 November 2009 by 9:00 AM local time, Frederick, MD. Questions must be sent via email to [justin.pickett@amedd.army.mil](mailto:justin.pickett@amedd.army.mil), Subject W81XWH-10-T-0029. No telephonic questions will be accepted. Answers to questions will be addressed by amendment to the solicitation. Proposals are due to the Government point of contact no later than 11 December 2009 by 1:00 PM local time, Frederick, MD. Proposals must be emailed to [justin.pickett@amedd.army.mil](mailto:justin.pickett@amedd.army.mil), Subject W81XWH-10-T-0029.

**NOTE: Only one proposal will be accepted from each offeror.**

**2.0 FILE FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS**

**2.1** The submission shall be clearly indexed and logically assembled. Each volume should be clearly identified and should begin at the top of a page. All pages of each volume should be appropriately numbered and identified by the complete company name, date and solicitation number in the header and/or footer. Each paragraph should be separated by at least one blank line. A standard, 12-point minimum font size applied, Times New Roman font is preferred. Volume I, Non-Cost/Price Proposal is limited to 40 pages.

**2.2** One (1) original and two (2) copies of each Proposal Volume shall be submitted. Additionally, one copy of each Proposal Volume shall be provided on virus-free CD-ROM compatible with Microsoft Office 2003 applications. Do not use compressed file formats. A separate CD is required for each Proposal Volume.

**3.0 VOLUME CONTENT****3.1 VOLUME I, NON-COST/PRICE PROPOSAL**

**3.1.1** Technical Approach. The Offeror shall submit a written technical proposal which effectively demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of the tasks to be performed, demonstrates a comprehensive staffing plan to efficiently

deliver timely high quality services within stated timelines, and provides a draft “Incoming Transition Plan” and a draft “Outgoing Transition Plan.” The Offeror’s proposal shall demonstrate an understanding of the major deliverables identified in the solicitation in sufficient detail to provide the Government an understanding of the manner and method of management during contract performance and should detail the integration of any proposed subcontractors.

**3.1.2 Relevant Experience.** The Offeror shall submit written information which effectively demonstrates the Offeror’s relevant experience in performing services contained in the solicitation. The proposal shall provide evidence of the Offeror’s experience (for this purpose, experience refers to what an Offeror has done, not how well it was accomplished) in performing same or similar tasks required by the solicitation. The Offeror’s proposal shall demonstrate the amount of relevant corporate experience possessed by the Offeror (to include any proposed subcontractors) as well as demonstrate the amount of relevant experience possessed by proposed Key Personnel. The Offeror shall provide evidence that the organization has current capabilities for assuring performance of this requirement.

Offerors shall submit resumes of proposed Key Positions, as described in the PWS, for the Government's use in evaluating the background, skills, experience, and education of proposed Contractor employees (either current employees or individuals who have signed a letter of intent), for these Key Positions. Offerors shall submit resumes of only current employees or of those individuals who have signed a letter of intent to accept employment with the Offeror.

**NOTE:** Substitution of proposed Key Personnel will not be allowed for a period of six (6) months after award, except in cases of death, illness, or other extreme circumstance. Any substitution or replacement Key Personnel shall have qualifications equal to or greater than the individuals proposed. The Government must pre-approve any replacement or substitution of Key Personnel.

**3.1.3 Quality Control Approach.** The Offeror shall submit a written demonstration of their approach to control the quality of services and deliverables identified in the solicitation. The contractor shall demonstrate the processes, procedures and metrics that will be utilized to ensure high quality services and deliverables are consistently provided to the Government within contract price and on schedule.

**3.1.4 Past Performance.** The Offeror shall provide a list of at least 3, but no more than 5, references of relevant past and present contracts for Federal, State and/or City agencies and commercial customers within the past 3 years. “Relevant” is defined as like service as stated in this solicitation’s Statement of Work in terms of similar scope and complexity. References must include:

- Name of the Organization that will be providing the reference,
- Name of the Point of Contact (POC),
- POC Telephone Number,
- POC Email address,
- Contract Number,
- Period of Performance, and
- Scope of Work.

Past performance information will be utilized to determine the quality of the contractor’s past performance as it relates to the probability of success of the required effort. The Offeror shall ensure that contract information is accurate and up-to-date, as references will be checked.

## **3.2 VOLUME II, BUSINESS PROPOSAL**

**3.2.1 Cost/Price .** Certified cost and pricing data will not be required if adequate competition exists. If the Government determines adequate competition was not obtained, the Government reserves the right to request

certified cost and pricing data. The Offeror shall submit a completed Excel Pricing Sheet utilizing the format provided. The Offeror must propose on all contract line items for the base and all contract option periods.

**3.2.2 Contractor Representations and Certifications.** The Offeror shall complete the annual representations and certifications electronically through the Online Representations and Certifications Application (ORCA) at <http://orca.bpn.gov>.

**3.2.3** With their proposal submission, the Offeror must acknowledge any amendments to the solicitation that were released.

#### **4.0 “TRADEOFF” EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

##### **4.1 BASIS FOR AWARD**

A single fixed priced contract award will be made on a competitive best value basis, using “tradeoff” among cost/price and non-cost/price factors. The Government may elect to award to other than the lowest priced Offeror, or other than the highest technically rated Offeror. If the award is made to the superior technical Offeror, then a cost/technical tradeoff will have to be determined and qualified. Non-Cost/Price factors will include Technical Approach, Relevant Experience, Quality Control Approach, and Past Performance and are numbered below in descending order of importance. Past Performance will be evaluated independently from the other non-cost/price evaluation factors. Cost/Price will be evaluated independently from all non-cost/price factors.

The evaluation factors are as follows:

- (1) Technical Approach
- (2) Relevant Experience
- (3) Quality Control Approach
- (4) Past Performance
- (5) Cost/Price

Government evaluators will not assume that the offeror possesses any capability or knowledge unless it is specified in the proposal.

After each of the above non-cost/price factors is rated individually, an overall rating will be assigned collectively to all factors less past performance. If any of the above non-cost/price evaluation factors receives an individual rating of “Unacceptable”, the collective overall rating will also be “Unacceptable”. Only proposals receiving an overall rating of “Acceptable” or higher will be considered for award.

Of the non-cost/price factors, the non-past performance factors are more important in their totality than past performance.

The non-cost/price factors (including Past Performance) are more important in their totality than cost/price.

As the technical proposals reach equality in the evaluation of non cost factors, the cost proposals become a more important factor in the overall cost/technical tradeoff analysis. Each Offeror must fully document and substantiate a cross mapping of their cost approach as it equates to the technical approach listed in the evaluation criteria. Please note that unsubstantiated costs that are considered unrealistic or unsupported or both may cause the overall technical evaluation to be adjusted in one or more of the factors listed in the non cost evaluation factors upon the completion of the cost/technical tradeoff analysis.

##### **4.3 EVALUATION APPROACH**

The following criteria will be used to evaluate the contract proposals. Evaluation criteria are numbered, and described below, in descending order of importance: (1) Technical Approach, (2) Experience, (3) Quality Control Approach, and (4) Past Performance. The collective total of all these non price technical evaluation criteria is significantly more important than price.

#### **4.3.1 Evaluation Factor 1-Technical Approach**

The degree to which the Offeror's technical approach (including approach to staffing) reflects a clear understanding of all the tasks listed and/or described the PWS and all the requirements for the Transition Plan for Incoming Transition, and a reasonable, well-thought-out approach that is likely to yield the required results within the required time frame. Particular emphasis will be applied to evaluation of the technical approach for accomplishing the following task areas specified in Section 3.0 of the PWS and Transition Plan(s).

#### **4.3.2 Evaluation Factor 2- Relevant Experience**

The degree to which the Offeror's proposal reflects corporate or proposed staff experience identical to, similar to, or related to the requirement. Additionally, the Offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the amount of relevant experience possessed by proposed Key Personnel.

#### **4.3.3 Evaluation Factor 4-Quality Control Approach**

The degree to which the Offeror's approach to quality control identifies processes, procedures, and metrics that are likely to predict successful outcomes within cost and on schedule.

#### **4.3.4 Evaluation Factor 5-Past Performance**

The degree to which past performance evaluations either included in the proposal or identified by the evaluators in any other manner, reflect success in performing the tasks listed and/or described in Section 3.0, Specific Tasks, of this PWS and the degree to which these evaluations of past performance reflect a management approach that encourages customer satisfaction and collaboration. Particular emphasis will be applied in the evaluation to relevant past performance with respect to the following task areas specified in Section 3.0 of the PWS.

The Government may also consider information obtained through other sources.

#### **4.3.5 Evaluation Factor 6-Price/Cost**

The degree to which the proposed cost/price is fair and reasonable; and that a complete business proposal has been submitted. The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

### **5.0 Type of Contract**

The Contract type will be Firm Fixed Price (FFP).

**Past Performance Rating Standards for the Non Cost/Price Proposal**

Rating	Definition and Criteria
Low Risk (LR)	Verification of past performance shows that offeror consistently meets work schedules, provides specified services, meets contract terms without failure or resolves issues immediately, and has not been defaulted on any contract within the past three years.
Moderate Risk (MR)	Verification of past performance shows offeror meets work schedules and specified services most of the time, meets contract terms without failure or resolves issues immediately, and has not been defaulted on any contract within the past three years.
High Risk (HR)	Verification of past performance shows that offeror has consistently not met work schedules and other obligations, has defaulted on at least one contract within the past three years, or has chronically failed to meet contract terms, or the past performance information provided is not relevant to this requirement.
Unknown Risk (UR)	<p>No record of past performance or contact information (telephone, facsimile, or electronic mail address) is available and/or is not valid and/or the points of contact or agencies could not be reached.</p> <p><i>IAW FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), in the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.</i></p>

**Rating Standards for the Non Cost/Price Proposal (Excluding Past Performance)**

Rating	Definition and Criteria
Exceptional (E)	<p>The proposal has exceptional merit and reflects an excellent approach which should clearly result in the superior attainment of all requirements and objectives. The proposed approach includes numerous substantial advantages, and essentially no disadvantages, and can be expected to result in outstanding performance. The solutions proposed are considered very low risk in that they are exceptionally clear and precise, fully supported, and demonstrate a complete understanding of the requirements.</p> <p>Risk Level: Very Low</p>
Good (G)	<p>The proposal demonstrates a sound approach which is expected to meet all requirements and objectives. This approach includes substantial advantages, and few relatively minor disadvantages, which collectively can be expected to result in better than satisfactory performance. The solutions proposed are considered to reflect low risk in that they are clear and precise, supported, and demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements.</p> <p>Risk Level: Low</p>
Acceptable (A)	<p>The proposal demonstrates an approach which is capable of meeting all requirements and objectives. The approach may have both advantages and disadvantages, however any disadvantages do not outweigh the advantages and the approach can be expected to result in satisfactory performance. The solutions proposed are considered to reflect moderate risk in that they are for the most part clear, precise, and supported, and demonstrate a general understanding of all the requirements.</p> <p>Risk Level: Moderate</p>
Marginal (M)	<p>The proposal does not demonstrate a full understanding of all the requirements and may pose a risk that the offeror might fail to perform satisfactorily without significant Government oversight or participation. Any advantages that may exist in the approach are outweighed by existing disadvantages. The solutions proposed are considered to reflect high risk in that they lack clarity and precision, or are unsupported.</p> <p>Risk Level: High</p>
Unacceptable (U)	<p>The proposal demonstrates an approach which will very likely not be capable of meeting all requirements and objectives. This approach has one or more substantial disadvantages or contains a deficiency. Collectively, the advantages and disadvantages are not likely to result in satisfactory performance. The solutions proposed are considered to reflect very high risk in that they lack any clarity or precision, are unsupported, or indicate a lack of understanding of the requirement.</p> <p>Risk Level: Very High.</p>

**(e) Tradeoff Evaluation Standard Definitions**

Rating	The evaluators' conclusions (supported by narrative write-ups) identifying the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies of an evaluation factor or subfactor. The ratings for each Non-Cost/Price Factor and each of its Subfactors will be expressed as an adjective.
Strength	Any aspect of a proposal that, when judged against a stated evaluation criterion, enhances the merit of the proposal or increases the probability of successful performance of the contract.
Significant Strength	A significant strength appreciably enhances the merit of a proposal or appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance.
Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness	A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Deficiency	A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.
Proposal Risk	Proposal risks are those risks associated with the likelihood that an offeror's proposed approach will meet the requirements of the solicitation.
Performance Risk	Performance risks are those risks associated with an offeror's likelihood of success in performing the solicitation's requirements as indicated by that offeror's record of current or past performance.
Advantage	Any state, circumstance, opportunity, or means specially favorable to successful contract performance or the Government's overall interest.
Disadvantage	Any state, circumstance, opportunity, or means specially unfavorable to successful contract performance or the Government's overall interest.

(End of Summary of Changes)